



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,783	02/13/2002	Kevin Carl Archibald	15-EC-6102	9498
23465	7590	05/09/2006	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. BEULICK C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST LOUIS, MO 63102-2740			PASS, NATALIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/683,783	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ARCHIBALD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Natalie A. Pass	<b>Art Unit</b> 3626	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>22 August 2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Notice to Applicant***

1. This communication is in response to the application filed 13 February 2002. Claims 1-24 are pending. The IDS filed 22 August 2002 has been entered and considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2, 9-10, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Malley et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0026408.

(A) As per claim 1, O'Malley teaches a network based method for facilitating providing a customer with a quote for at least one of a manufactured product and a service, said method comprising:

receiving data relating to at least one of a customer desired product and a customer desired service (O'Malley; paragraphs [0005], [0028]);

Art Unit: 3626

providing the customer a budgetary quote based on the received data (O'Malley; paragraph [0028]);

receiving a customer response based on the budgetary quote (O'Malley; paragraph [0029]);

and providing the customer a contractual quote based on the received customer response (O'Malley; paragraphs [0028], [0032], [0039]).

(B) As per claim 2, O'Malley teaches a method as analyzed and discussed in claim 1 above

wherein receiving data relating to at least one of a customer desired product and a customer desired service comprises receiving data relating to at least one of a customer desired medical product and a customer desired medical service (O'Malley; paragraphs [0005], [0028]); Examiner interprets O'Malley's teachings of "[a] quote may be in relation to any product or service that user 109 may have an interest in or is offering for sale" (O'Malley; paragraph [0028]) to include medical products and services.

(C) Claim 9 differs from method claim 1, in that it is a system rather than a method for providing a customer with a quote for at least one of a manufactured product and a service.

System claims 9-10 repeat the subject matter of claims 1-2, respectively, as a set of elements rather than a series of steps. As the underlying processes of claims 1-2 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the teachings of O'Malley in the above rejection of claims 1-2, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed by O'Malley includes the apparatus to perform these

Art Unit: 3626

functions. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claims 1-2, and incorporated herein.

(D) Claims 17-18 differ from method claims 1-2 by reciting a “computer readable medium encoded with a program...” in the preamble. As per this limitation, O’Malley clearly discloses her invention to be implemented on a “computer readable medium encoded with a program” (O’Malley; paragraph [0011]). The remainder of claims 17-18 repeat the limitations of claims 1-2, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claims 1-2, and incorporated herein.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O’Malley et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0026408 as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and further in view of Singh, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0047311.

(A) As per claim 3, O’Malley teaches a method as analyzed and discussed in claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 3626

O'Malley fails to explicitly disclose a method further comprising prompting the customer to select a desired language from a plurality of languages.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Singh.

In particular, Singh teaches a method further comprising prompting the customer to select a desired language from a plurality of languages. (Singh; paragraphs [0034], [0040], [0047]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of O'Malley to include these limitations, as taught by Singh, with the motivations of providing "a system and method for executing transactions that streamlines the procurement process, and minimizes the costs in time, materials, and human effort" while overcoming barriers that arise "where buyer and supplier are located in different geographic areas, and in particular within different countries: for example, language barriers" (Singh; paragraphs [0006], [0016]).

(B) Claim 11 differs from method claim 3, in that it is a system rather than a method for providing a customer with a quote for at least one of a manufactured product and a service.

System claim 11 repeats the subject matter of claim 3, respectively, as a set of elements rather than a series of steps. As the underlying processes of claim 3 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the collective teachings of O'Malley and Singh in the above rejection of claim 3, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed collectively by O'Malley and Singh includes the apparatus to perform these functions. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claim 3, and incorporated herein.

(C) Claim 19 differs from method claim 3 by reciting a “computer readable medium encoded with a program...” in the preamble. As per this limitation, O’Malley clearly discloses her invention to be implemented on a “computer readable medium encoded with a program” (O’Malley; paragraph [0011]). The remainder of claim 19 repeats the limitations of claim 3, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 3, and incorporated herein.

6. Claims 4-8, 12-16, and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O’Malley et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0026408 as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and further in view of Duke, International Publication Number WO 01/37177 A1.

(A) As per claim 8, O’Malley teaches a network based method for facilitating providing a customer with a quote for at least one of a medical product and a medical service, said method comprising:

receiving data relating to at least one of a customer desired medical product and a customer desired medical service (O’Malley; paragraphs [0005], [0028]); Examiner interprets O’Malley’s teachings of “any product or service” (O’Malley; paragraph [0028]) to include medical products and services;

publishing a budgetary quote as an Extensible Markup Language (XML) document (O’Malley; paragraph [0032]);

Art Unit: 3626

“storing” (reads on “loading”) the XML budgetary quote in a “database server” (reads on “quote repository”) (O’Malley; paragraph [0032]);

“communicate the quote to user” (reads on “sending an email alert to the customer”) (O’Malley; paragraph [0028]);

providing the customer access to view the budgetary quote via the URL (O’Malley; paragraph [0029]);

receiving a customer response based on the budgetary quote (O’Malley; paragraph [0029]);

publishing a contractual quote as an Extensible Markup Language (XML) document (O’Malley; paragraphs [0032], [0039]);

“storing” (reads on “loading”) the XML contractual quote in a “database server” (reads on “quote repository”) (O’Malley; paragraph [0032], [0039]);

“communicate the quote to user” (reads on “sending an email alert to the customer”) (O’Malley; paragraph [0028]);

providing the customer access to view the budgetary quote via the URL (O’Malley; paragraph [0029], [0039]); and

receiving a customer response comprising at least one of a message to a manufacturer, an acceptance of the contractual quote, and a denial of the contractual quote (O’Malley; paragraphs [0029]-[0030], [0039]).

Although O’Malley teaches accessing websites to access online quotes (O’Malley; paragraphs [0028], [0032]-[0033]), O’Malley fails to explicitly disclose

Art Unit: 3626

wherein said email alert comprises a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) indicating a location of the published budgetary quote; and

wherein said email alert comprises a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) indicating a location of the published contractual quote.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Duke.

In particular, Duke teaches

wherein said “advertisement” (reads on “email alert”) comprises an “internet address” to an “internet quote site” (reads on “a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) indicating a location of the published budgetary quote”) (Duke; page 8, lines 14-19, page 21, lines 15-19); and

wherein said “advertisement” (reads on “email alert”) comprises an “internet address” to an “internet quote site” (reads on “a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) indicating a location of the published contractual quote”) (Duke; page 8, lines 14-19, page 21, lines 15-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of O’Malley to include these limitations, as taught by Duke, with the motivations of providing “a web site that reduces buyers’ search costs” (Duke; page 9, lines 16-21).

(B) As per claim 4, O’Malley teaches a method as analyzed and discussed in claim 1 above.

wherein providing the customer a budgetary quote based on the received data comprises:  
publishing the budgetary quote as an Extensible Markup Language (XML) document (O’Malley; paragraph [0032]);

“storing” (reads on “loading”) the XML budgetary quote in a “database server” (reads on “quote repository”) (O’Malley; paragraph [0032]); and

“communicate the quote to user” (reads on “sending an email alert to the customer”) (O’Malley; paragraph [0028]).

Although O’Malley teaches accessing websites to access online quotes (O’Malley; paragraphs [0028], [0032]-[0033]), O’Malley fails to explicitly disclose

wherein said email alert comprises a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) indicating a location of the published budgetary quote.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Duke.

In particular, Duke teaches

wherein said “advertisement” (reads on “email alert”) comprises an “internet address” to an “internet quote site” (reads on “a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) indicating a location of the published contractual quote”) (Duke; page 8, lines 14-19, page 21, lines 15-19).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of O’Malley and Duke are as given in the rejection of claim 8 above, and incorporated herein.

(C) As per claims 5-7, O’Malley and Duke teach a method as analyzed and discussed in claims 1 and 4 above

wherein providing the customer a budgetary quote based on the received data further comprises:

providing the customer access to view the budgetary quote via the URL (O’Malley; paragraph [0029], [0039]); and

Art Unit: 3626

receiving a customer response comprising at least one of a message to the manufacturer and a request for a contractual quote (O'Malley; paragraphs [0029]-[0030], [0039]);

wherein providing the customer a contractual quote based on the received data comprises:  
publishing the contractual quote as an Extensible Markup Language (XML) document (O'Malley; paragraph [0032]);

“storing” (reads on “loading”) the XML contractual quote in a “database server” (reads on “quote repository”) (O'Malley; paragraph [0032], [0039]); and

“communicate the quote to user” (reads on “sending an email alert to the customer”) (O'Malley; paragraph [0028]).

wherein said “advertisement” (reads on “email alert”) comprises an “internet address” to an “internet quote site” (reads on “a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) indicating a location of the published contractual quote”) (Duke; page 8, lines 14-19, page 21, lines 15-19);

wherein providing the customer a contractual quote based on the received data further comprises:

providing the customer access to view the budgetary quote via the URL (O'Malley; paragraph [0029], [0039]); and

receiving a customer response comprising at least one of a message to a manufacturer, an acceptance of the contractual quote, and a denial of the contractual quote (O'Malley; paragraphs [0029]-[0030], [0039]).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of O'Malley and Duke are as given in the rejection of claim 8 above, and incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 3626

(D) Claims 12, 16 differ from method claims 4, 8 in that they recite a system rather than a method for providing a customer with a quote.

System claims 12-15, and 16 repeat the subject matter of claims 4-7, and 8, respectively, as a set of elements rather than a series of steps. As the underlying processes of claims 4-7, and 8 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the collective teachings of O'Malley and Duke in the above rejection of claims 4-7, and 8, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed collectively by O'Malley and Duke includes the apparatus to perform these functions. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claims 4-7, and 8 and incorporated herein.

(E) Claims 20-23, and 24 differ from method claims 4-7 and 8 by reciting a "computer readable medium encoded with a program..." in the preamble. As per this limitation, O'Malley clearly discloses her invention to be implemented on a "computer readable medium encoded with a program" (O'Malley; paragraph [0011]). The remainder of claims 20-23 and 24 repeat the limitations of claims 4-7, and 8 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claims 4-7, and 8 and incorporated herein.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied references Avery, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0208365, Morgan, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087583, Henley, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0065758, Coffman, et

Art Unit: 3626

al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0215467, Khan., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0056395, Grover, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0188484, and Radjy et al, U.S. Patent Number 6, 687, 559 teach the environment of network based quotes for products and services.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington D.C. 20231**

or faxed to: **(571) 273-8300.**

For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" on the front page of the communication and do NOT sign the communication. After Final communications should be labeled "Box AF."

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie A. Pass whose telephone number is (571) 272-6774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached at (571) 272-6776. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

Art Unit: 3626

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Natalie A. Pass

April 27, 2006



C. LUKE GILLIGAN  
PATENT EXAMINER